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1.0. Introduction

Since the beginning of the millennium, a growing number of studies of the Hebrew Bible have used insights from a novel paradigm in the study of language, namely, cognitive linguistics (=CL).\(^1\) New linguistic models take time to become established and are sometimes accompanied by a variety of schools of thought, often each with its own meta-language. It is no wonder that biblical scholars typically show some resistance to engaging with “another new linguistic model.”\(^2\) More problematic is the fact that CL is not a coherent model that is ready-made to be applied to the analysis and description of a non-spoken ancient language with a limited corpus.\(^3\) Like most other modern linguistic models, it assumes the availability of living speakers and/or

---

\(^1\) For CL applications to Biblical Studies in general, see Howe and Green (2014).

\(^2\) See Burton (2017, 17).

\(^3\) Shead (2011, 181–87) provides a relatively detailed and sobering discussion of the “ancient language problem” and the “corpus of BH.” See also Burton (2017, 34–41).
large written corpora to consult. Nevertheless, CL has been embraced by a number of BH scholars. For example, De Blois (2002) announced a new *Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* that is based on CL principles. Van Wolde (2009) called for a “Reframing of Biblical Studies” in a monograph based on the cognitive concepts of Ronald Langacker. Van Hecke (2011) used insights from cognitive semantics to better understand Job 12–14. Burton (2017) called her study of the semantics of glory “A cognitive, corpus-based approach to Hebrew word meaning.” And Coleman (2018) provided a cognitive linguistic perspective on BH transitivity alternation.\(^4\) A number of studies have focused on the conceptual metaphors and/or metonyms that undergird the use of language (especially figurative language) in the Hebrew Bible, e.g., Kruger (2000); Kotze (2004; 2005); Van Hecke (2005); Basson (2006); Jindo (2010); Van Hecke and Labahn (2010); Chau (2011; 2014; 2015); De Joode and van Loon (2014); Lamprecht (2015); De Joode (2018); van Loon (2018); and Ruark (2019).

The problem for BH scholars is that CL is a vast field of study,\(^5\) and to determine what exactly is meant by a cognitive approach, or even to start critically assessing its advantages, is a challenge. The aim of this descriptive study is to enable scholars of BH to orientate themselves as far as a substantial number of applications of CL insights into BH are concerned. I postulate that for these purposes a basic understanding of what CL is, and which

\(^4\) See also §3.0 of this study.

\(^5\) Cf. Dirvin (2005, 50); Geeraerts and Cuyckens (2007); Taylor and Littlemore (2014); Dąbrowska and Divjak (2015); Dancygier (2017); and Evans (2019).
different stands of CL can be distinguished is needed. Furthermore, in order to be aware of the most promising, but also the more controversial, aspects of CL, it is also important to have basic insight into current CL developments and acknowledged challenges.

Concerns of space preclude a full discussion of applications of CL insights to BH. Those that focus on conceptual metaphor and metonymy,\(^6\) for example, are excluded, as well as those considering the BH verbal system from a CL perspective.\(^7\) Nor has it been possible to critically assess the contributions of those insights that are dealt with here. It is assumed that a general methodological orientation is pivotal for the introduction I have in mind; hence the focus on the methodological orientation(s) of the exponents discussed.

We begin in §2.0 with a brief overview of CL, explaining its main focus, positioning it within the field of linguistics, and describing its commitments and basic points of departure. This is followed by a bird’s eye view of the different schools of thought, referred to as ‘strands’ within CL. The section concludes with a summary of current developments in CL and some of the widely acknowledged challenges. In §3.0 the scope and the theoretical underpinnings of a range of applications of insights from CL to

\(^6\) Most of these studies almost uncritically accept Lakoff and Johnson (1980). See §2.2.2 below.

\(^7\) See, e.g., Robar (2014). The significant contribution (and substantial number of publications) by Andrason on the verbal system of BH and other Semitic languages merits a paper of its own. See, e.g., Andrason (2011; 2012) and, more recently, his work on serial verb constructions (2019).
BH are profiled in the light of the bigger picture of CL. In conclusion, a few general trends are pointed out.

## 2.0. Overview of CL

### 2.1. Commitments and Hypotheses

CL is a label that is used for a “broad movement within modern linguistics” (Taylor 2002, 3). In this movement ‘meaning’ is put at the heart of the linguistic enterprise. Dąbrowska (2016, 479) states succinctly:

> Cognitive Linguistics is an approach to language study based on three central premises: that the function of language is to convey meaning, that linguistic description must rely on constructs that are psychologically real and that grammar emerges from usage.

CL emerged in the late 1970s out of dissatisfaction with the generative approaches of that time that treated language as an abstract and decontextualised system.

This recontextualising and maximalist approach to meaning is nothing new. Geeraerts (2010, 1–45) illustrates how much in common it has with pre-structuralist historical-philological semantics. Van Hecke (2011, 290–94) explains in what ways CL refines the latter, but also “often gratefully adopts the structuralist field descriptions and the componential analyses as valid descriptive tools.”

CL, however, differs from the latter approaches in that it is guided by two primary commitments: (1) to view and describe language in terms of what is known about the brain and cognitive processes (the cognitive commitment) and (2) to describe linguistic
knowledge as the outcome of general cognitive abilities and not specific modules of the mind (*the generalisation commitment*). Geeraerts (2016, 537) has recently provided convincing arguments as to why the cognitive commitment has to be complemented with a *socio-semiotic commitment*, which is
to make one’s account of human language accord with the status of language as a social semiotic, i.e., intersubjective, historically and socially variable tool, and to base that account on a methodology that likewise transcends the individual.\(^8\)

What is crucial is that such a functional view of language “fits well into the currently popular conception of language as a Complex Dynamic System” (Geeraerts 2016a, 530).\(^9\) This implies that linguistic meaning is dynamic and flexible, and able to change in order accommodate new experiences and situations.

Apart from these commitments, the theoretical approaches that can be subsumed under the label CL are undergirded by a sophisticated view of categorisation.\(^10\) One of the basic tenets of

\(^8\) Geeraerts (2016a, 528), however, states:

This social turn, it should be pointed out, is not a complete novelty in the history of Cognitive Linguistics, given that, for instance, the notion of ‘cultural model’ played a significant role in the emergence of the new framework…. It is therefore best characterized as a deliberate strengthening and foregrounding of an initially secondary feature.

\(^9\) See also Andrason (2014).

this view of categorisation is that members of a category are not equal, with some members more salient and/or central than others. The former are regarded as the prototypical members. Those that share some sort of family relationship form overlapping clusters within their category; e.g., in the category fruit, one gets fruit that is sweet, fruit that is juicy, fruit that grows on trees, etc. In short, members of a category often display what has been called a ‘radially structured network’. A crucial extension of these insights has been that the same type of clustering that takes place within one sense category (like fruit) also takes place among the different extended senses that the lexeme may acquire.

11 According to Langacker (1987, 102), the human ability to compare, pick out differences, and establish similarities between entities is fundamental to all human cognition. However, entities that are similar are not always similar to the same degree, for a number of reasons; e.g., on the one hand, perception is influenced by both individual and shared social values and, on the other hand, perception tends to take place in terms of figure-and-ground configurations in particular contexts by specific individuals. This is why one of the primary ways that humans organise their worlds, i.e., in terms of categories, is regarded by Langacker (1987, 371) as forming conceptual structures that involves schemas, prototypes, and instances. Schemas are patterns that are abstracted on the basis of the features that all instances share. Prototypes are typical instances of a category, but not all instances of a category are prototypical. A crucial feature of prototypes is that they are not objective realities, but construals that are “culture-dependent, content-dependent and mind-dependent” (Van Wolde 2009, 26).

12 For a diagram in this regard, see Geeraerts (2010, 191).
through a process of generalisation (fruits of nature) or metaphorical extension (e.g., fruits of someone’s labour).\textsuperscript{13} The fact that these types of extensions occur is not a novel insight of CL; it was already one of the focal points of historical-philological semantics. However, what is novel are insights into the ‘drivers’ of sense extensions, e.g., the vagueness and under-specification of less prototypical members of a sense category in cases of specialisation and generalisation; the bodily and/or culturally convention-ali\textsuperscript{14}ised experiential contingency, as well as any perceived contingency in the case of the metonymic, and similarities in the case of metaphorical extensions, as well as the role that established conceptual metonyms and metaphors play.\textsuperscript{14} Also crucial is the insight that radially structured maps of polysemous senses are not stored as static entities in the brain, but that context is always “needed to pin down an actual, currently active sense” (Dirven 2005, 26). Also novel are the nature and effects of sense extensions. Sense extension is a gradual process and the semantic potential of a sense category may constitute a continuum of senses rather than discrete units. A third novelty is the pervasiveness of polysemy at all levels of linguistic description.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} For a diagram, see Geeraerts (2010, 194).

\textsuperscript{14} See Gries (2015, 473–78) and Geeraerts (2016b, 233–47).

\textsuperscript{15} Compare the polysemy of the constructions discussed in Locatell (2017); Van der Merwe (2018); Coleman (2018); and Khan and Van der Merwe (2020).
Approaches that are labelled as CL also tend to adhere to a number of basic hypotheses.\textsuperscript{16} The first is the \textit{symbolic thesis}.\textsuperscript{17} According this thesis, language is a structured collection of conventionalised linguistic units, each representing a \textit{form-meaning pair}\textsuperscript{18} or ‘symbolic unit’.\textsuperscript{19} This implies, firstly, that forms cannot be studied independently of their meanings. The forms that are involved may range from a phoneme, a grammatical morpheme, a syntactic construction (e.g., a phrase or a clause) to a lexical construction. The meanings of these forms may range from the highly schematic meanings of grammatical constructions,\textsuperscript{20} at one end of the continuum, to very specific meanings of lexical units, at the other end of the grammar-lexicon continuum. For this reason, the second implication of the symbolic thesis is that there is no qualitative distinction between syntax and the study

\textsuperscript{16} The hypotheses listed here are a combination of those described by Croft and Cruse (2004); Geeraerts (2006); and Evans (2012, 2019). See also Riemer (2010, 238). Most of these theses can be related to the way in which humans categorise.

\textsuperscript{17} See also Langacker (2013, 14–26) and Evans (2019, 566–68).

\textsuperscript{18} The symbolic thesis has some resemblance to Saussure’s view of language as a system of signs and his distinction between the signifier and the signified. However, for CL there is not a simple one-to-one relationship between a phonological entity (the signifier) and a semantic entity (the signified); see Taylor (2002, 53–58).

\textsuperscript{19} The symbolic unit is also referred to as a ‘symbolic assembly’ or ‘symbolic construction’.

\textsuperscript{20} At the level of syntax, the form of a symbolic assembly or construction may be NP1:SUBJECT VERB NP2:OBJECT and the meaning be: X ACTED ON and AFFECTS Y.
of semantics. The main difference between grammatical and lexical meaning is that the former is more internally complex and schematic than the latter.

According to the second hypothesis, the usage-based thesis, “categories and structures in semantics, syntax, morphology and phonology are built from our cognition of specific occasions of use” (Croft and Cruse 2004, 2–3). Symbolic units are in essence mental routines, i.e., the creation of form and meaning pairs that emerge through convention as language is used.21 Symbolic units that are used frequently become entrenched and often shape the language system as patterns of usage. This implies that knowledge of a language is knowing how it is used. An implication of this thesis is that corpora are a prime source of linguistic evidence.

The third hypothesis is that of embodied cognition.22 This means that when humans interact with (and/or talk about) the world that they live in, the ‘reality’ that they represent linguistically is always the outcome of their bodily experiences as both individuals and members of a social group in specific situations. Hence the notion ‘situated embodiment’ (Dirven 2005, 30). Language therefore does not reflect the world objectively; it represents an embodied (i.e., a bodily construed) perspective on the

21 Crucial to keep in mind is that symbolic units may differ in terms of schematicity. Some may be nouns with specific meanings, e.g., cat, house, car. Some may be phrases, e.g., prepositional phrases with the more generic meaning of location of an entity in space. Others may be clause types, e.g., transitive clauses, with a highly schematic meaning referred to in the previous footnote.

22 See also Bergen (2015, 10–30).
world. Furthermore, these mental representations do not emerge from, or exist in, a vacuum. They are grounded in the past experiences of the individual and the shared experiences, values, and conventions of the social group that they belong to—and those, of course, are symbolised in terms of the entrenched patterns of use of that group.

The fourth thesis is that of encyclopaedic semantics. The structures at the semantic pole of symbolic units, i.e., the semantic representations of linguistic constructions, interface with the conceptual worlds of the speakers of a speech community. These conceptual worlds are made up of vast interrelated networks of knowledge. When a particular linguistic expression is used, access to a particular network of knowledge is facilitated. This particular network of knowledge is called the ‘semantic potential’ of a particular semantic structure. Evans (2019, 356–57) uses the lexical item red as an example to explain the notion ‘semantic potential’. When it is used, a range of hues of reds may be invoked. Which hues are invoked are determined first and foremost by the hues that have become associated with red for a particular speaker (and his/her speech community), e.g., the vivid red of red lipstick and the brownish red of a squirrel. Which aspect of the semantic potential is profiled is, in the case of adjectives, typically determined (constrained) by the noun that it is modifying—in this case lipstick or squirrel. Langacker regards the specific referent of the noun that is used in this case as the ‘base’

---

23 Langacker (1987) equates semantic structure with conceptual structure, while Evans (2009; 2012, 132) maintains that semantic structure and conceptual structure are two distinct representational formats.
against which the concept *red* is profiled. In each of the constructions ‘red lipstick’ and ‘red squirrel’ different domains, i.e., different parts of the encyclopaedic networks of a hearer’s knowledge, are activated.

The fifth hypothesis is that *linguistic meaning* does not reflect an objective world ‘out there’, but is *conceptualisation*—an implication of the thesis of embodied cognition. This is true of the specific meanings of lexical items as well as the schematic meanings of grammatical constructions. Langacker (2017, 263) states “an expression’s meaning depends not only on the conceptual *content* it invokes but also a *construal*, our capacity to conceive and portray the same situation in alternative ways.”

__________________________________________________________________________


26 A concept is “a mental representation that can serve as the meaning of a linguistic expression;” see Shead (2011, 33–34).

27 For the parameters that can constrain a construal, see Shead (2011, 37–38).
2.2. Strands, Developments, and Challenges

As I indicated in the first line of §2.1 above, CL is by no means a unified model. Since cognition involves a variety of human faculties, it is in a sense inevitably multidisciplinary. Dirven (2005, 17–68) has identified five strands, the first two of which may be regarded as “lexico-grammatical-pragmatic theories of language” (Van Wolde 2009, 30).

2.2.1. The Gestalt-psychological Strand

A gestalt-psychological strand was pioneered by Talmy28 and then further worked out by Langacker in his Cognitive Grammar29 (1987, 1991). A key principle in this regard is that human perception typically takes place in terms of a prominent figure and a less salient ground. Langacker “applies this principle to linguistic structuring at all levels” (Dirven 2005, 19).

According to Langacker (2017, 262), the initial phase of Cognitive Grammar “provided a unified account of lexicon, morphology and syntax... comprising a continuum of form-meaning pairs.” The second phase of Cognitive Grammar, which, according to Langacker (2017, 262), started around 2008, “envisages a unified account of structure, processing and discourse.”30

28 For an overview of Talmy’s work, see Evans (2019, 241–66).

29 Grammar is understood by Langacker not merely as morphology plus syntax, but in a broad sense as a theory of language that accounts for the meaning of linguistic constructions at all levels of linguistic description.

30 According to Langacker (2017, 283), the early results of the latter phase are still at best preliminary.
Some approaches, such as Fillmore’s Construction Grammars,\(^{31}\) Goldberg (1995) and Croft’s (2001) Radical Construction Grammar, and Embodied Construction Grammar (Bergen and Chang 2013), developed relatively independently of Cognitive Grammar, but share with Langacker’s approach the symbolic and usage-based theses, as well as the insight that grammatical constructions represent figure-ground perspectives on situations.\(^{32}\) However, a major difference is that while Cognitive Grammar “sees constructions as pairings of a semantic pole with a phonological pole,” Construction grammarians “also postulate (morpho-)syntactic information in their form pole” (Hoffmann 2017, 326). Their ‘form pole’, in other words, includes two types of information, i.e., phonological and grammatical information. For them, grammatical constructions, contra Langacker, are therefore a separate level of organisation. Evans (2019, 712–13) categorises Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar as a constructional approach to grammar. For him, the essential difference between the various constructional approaches is their definition of what constitutes a construction.

---

\(^{31}\) See, e.g., Kay and Fillmore (1999). Fillmore’s notion of Frame Semantics is encapsulated by his approach to Construction Grammar. In his templates for the description of constructions, a slot is provided for the relevant semantic and pragmatic features of a construction; see Evans (2019, 672–79). For the relationship between Frame Semantics and the FrameNet project, see Shead (2011, 108).

\(^{32}\) For a discussion on the different construction grammars, see Hoffman and Trousdale (2013) and, for an overview of them, Evans (2019, 661–716).
2.2.2. The Phenomenological Strand

A phenomenological strand developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Lakoff (1987) focuses on embodied meaning.\(^{33}\) In this strand, prototype theory, the radially structured networks of sense relations, conceptual metaphor theory,\(^{34}\) conceptual metonymic theory, and the notion of idealised cognitive models play pivotal roles.

2.2.3. The Cognitive Sociolinguistic Strand

A cognitive sociolinguistic strand associated with Geeraerts (1997; 2016a) focuses on an understanding of the social drivers of polysemy and linguistic variation. The strand also emphasises the cultural and ideological models that in general undergird the language of specific social groups. A conviction shared by the European scholars of this strand is that usage-data require the methods of corpus linguistics.\(^{35}\)

---

\(^{33}\) This strand is typically regarded as Cognitive Semantics. It must be distinguished from Talmy’s notion of cognitive semantics; see Evans (2019, 241–66).

\(^{34}\) The essence of conceptual metaphor theory is “that the human mind maps elements from concrete source domains onto the more abstract target domains of emotion, causality, event structure, and dozens of others. The concrete categories themselves are categorised on the basis of pre-conceptual spatial configurations shared by most living beings” (Dirven 2005, 27).

\(^{35}\) For corpus-driven approaches see, for example, Gries and Stefanowitsch (2006) and Glynn and Fischer (2010).
2.2.4. The Cognitive Discourse Strand

A cognitive discourse strand focuses on the textual levels of language structure. Here any proponent of mental space theory (Fauconnier 1997) and blending theory (Fauconnier and Turner 2002) “deals with the online processing of discourse via mental maps (‘mental spaces’) and their conceptual blending.” A seminal work in the application of conceptual metaphor theory to literature is that by Lakoff and Turner (1989). Turner’s (1996) work on the cognitive mechanisms that are involved in the construction of stories plays a foundational role in the application of CL to the study and analysis of literature, a sub-discipline called cognitive poetics. The latter sub-discipline also benefitted much from what Dirven (2005, 37–39) referred to as the cognitive discourse study of coherence links.

2.2.5. The Psycholinguistic Strand

A psycholinguistic strand is represented by experimental research on the cognitive processes that undergird the use of figurative language. Insights from mental space theory and blending theory were eventually used to better understand metaphor and metonymy (Fauconnier and Turner 1995). Mental space theory also provided an innovative model for interpreting conditional constructions; see Dancygier and Sweetser (2005).

For a succinct overview of cognitive poetics, see Evans (2019, 786–95).

See also, e.g., Sanders and Sweetser (2009).
language and language acquisition. Among the most pertinent recent findings are that metaphors are often understood without invoking first their literal meaning (Dirven 2005, 50).

2.2.6. Recent Developments

Most recent developments in CL may be regarded as a logical outcome of its user-based thesis (see above). The so-called quantitative turn,\footnote{This shift from the use of introspection as a way to extract data to the use of statistical analyses of corpus data started in the mid-1990s, but really took off only around 2008; see Janda (2013, 1–32).} i.e., a greater appreciation for, and use of, quantitative data, was sparked by the need to study the behaviour of linguistic constructions in their contexts of use. The complexity of the task of hand, i.e., all the relevant parameters involved when corpora have to be tagged and analysed, required sophisticated statistical methods. Although there has been some critique of all the ‘number crunching’ (e.g., Langacker 2016, 465–77), it is described by Divjak et al. (2016, 452) as the “catalyst for the ‘social revolution’” in CL (see Geeraerts’s call for a “socio-semiotic commitment” above, in §2.1). The quantitative turn confronted scholars with a wide range of socio-semiotic parameters that could be relevant for, on the one hand, fully understanding the use of specific linguistic constructions and, on the other hand, the diachronic development of the linguistic stock of a language.

While the majority of earlier CL studies focus on English and other Indo-European languages, in recent times some progress has been made in the cross-linguistic comparison of lan-
guages from a CL perspective in the field of lexical semantic typology,\footnote{See Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2015) and Divjak et al (2016, 456–57).} e.g., how the body parts are labelled and used in figurative extensions across languages.\footnote{See Kraska-Szlenk (2014, 15–39; 2020).} The study of language change has until recently been fairly marginal in CL (Divjak et al. 2016, 455). Another implication of the user-based thesis is that meaning is always emerging. Hilpert (2015, 347–51; 361–62), therefore, aptly argues that historical linguistics should be one of CL’s central concerns. In this regard, in particular as far as lexical semantic change is concerned, the works of Geeraerts (see the sociolinguistic strand above) have been seminal.\footnote{See Geeraerts (1997; 2010; 2015; 2016b; 2017).} As far as the evolution of grammar is concerned, Bybee et al. (1994), Heine et al. (1991), Traugott and Dasher (2002), Hopper and Traugott (2003) are the trail-blazers.\footnote{See also Hilpert (2015, 353–57) and Evans (2019, 717–43).}

In a recent article, Dąbrowska (2016, 479–91) lists seven challenges that cognitive linguists currently face. The most general concerns are, first, the fact that many cognitive linguistics still use intuition as their main data source and, second, that the Cognitive Commitment is apparently not always treated seriously (Dąbrowska 2016, 480–83). Of particular relevance for scholars of ancient languages are the following questions:

(1) How can the pivotal concept in CL, viz. subjective construal, be measured ‘objectively’?
How does one establish which are the relevant parameters (or frame elements) to tag when the distributional analysis of an expression is conducted? and

(3) How much insight into the mental representations of speakers of a language can patterns of use really provide? After all, the distribution of an expression may provide clues to its meaning, but does not equal its meaning.

According to Dirven (2005, 50–51), up to 2005 Langacker’s model was the most stable, most influential, and least criticised one. The irony is that Lakoff’s views on prototype theory and radial lexical networks, conceptual metaphor, and idealised cognitive models, which were more heavily criticised, have also been very popular (2005, 51). Nearly fifteen years later, it can be argued that Langacker’s views, although also drawing some critique, have stood the test of time. He has also recently advanced his research beyond the boundaries of sentences. In the meanwhile, some of the critiques levelled against Lakoff’s ideas have been addressed; see, e.g., Evans (2019, 267–97) for how weaknesses in prototype theory and the theory of idealised cognitive models have been addressed. In the same vein, Evans (2019, 300–46) reports about more refined versions of conceptual metaphor and metonymy theory. Of significance is Evans’s Access Semantic approach (2019, 458–90), which steers away from Lakoff’s

44 It is for this reason that Van Wolde (2009, 34) opted for Langacker’s model “to reframe biblical studies.”

45 See also Kovecses (2008, 168–84).
full-specification approach and associates itself with the latter’s “network” model (420–54).\textsuperscript{46}

Particularly relevant for scholars of BH has been the greater focus on how the meanings of linguistic expressions change over time; the use of linguistic-typological data; insights into grammaticalisation;\textsuperscript{47} and how the use of corpus linguistic methods can be used to study polysemy at all levels of language use.

### 3.0. Cognitive Approaches to Biblical Hebrew Studies

#### 3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this section is to ‘profile’ the application of CL insights against the ‘base’ of the overview provided above. I will make a distinction—whenever possible—between two major

\textsuperscript{46} See Falkum and Vicente (2015, 11–13) for a positive assessment of Evans’s semantic model.

\textsuperscript{47} Grammaticalisation is a sub-field of linguistics in general and not restricted to CL. There are various definitions of grammaticalisation, but according to Narrog and Heine (2011, 3), whenever there is debate as to whether a phenomenon is an instance of grammaticalisation or not, the classic definition of Kuryłowicz (1975 [1965]) is consulted, viz. “Grammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a grammatical to a more grammatical status.” Since CL focuses on the mechanism of meaning, i.e., how meaning works and how new meanings emerge as language is used, the diachronic perspective of grammaticalisation is foundational to the CL enterprise; see Chapter 7 of Langacker (1987).
groups, viz. those studies that can be associated mainly with Langacker and/or his approach, i.e., the Gestalt-psychological strand (§2.2.1, above), and those who appear to be more influenced by the initiatives of Lakoff and his cognitive semantics, i.e., the phenomenological strand (§2.2.2, above). Since, many of the latter’s views were refined in particular in the light of the greater appreciation for, and use of, quantitative and social data sparked by the ‘European’ CL wave, I will consider them part of the second group. Studies that are difficult to classify will be regarded as group 3.

3.2. Group 1

I commence with works that can be associated with Langacker. I do not list them chronologically, but rather according to how ‘closely’ they can be associated with Langacker.

Van Wolde (2009), with reference to Dirven (2005), restricts herself to the ‘stable’ model of Langacker. Not only is Van Wolde’s the most comprehensive attempt to apply CL insights to BH, it is also the broadest in scope.\(^{48}\) This is because it proposes a detailed cognitive method of OT exegesis (2009, 204), indicating how to account for (1) the socio-cultural embeddedness of the text the Hebrew Bible; (2) the lexical meaning of usage events; and (3) the meaning structure of biblical texts. She has also formulated an abridged version of her model (2009, 205). What is particularly helpful in Van Wolde’s approach is that she

\(^{48}\) It should also be noted that Van Wolde’s (2009) is one of a few CL applications to BH that is not based on a PhD project, but represents the work of an established scholar.
provides detailed examples of how each aspect of her model can be applied.

It is impossible to detail each of these examples here. I will focus on one, i.e., שַׁעַּר. The lexeme (i.e., the symbolic unit at the phonological pole) is typically used in a cognitive domain that can be labelled human artifacts > buildings > city⁴⁹ and illustrates in particular the sociocultural embeddedness of BH. By carefully comparing the archaeological evidence of city gates from the ninth to the fifth century BCE with instances in the Hebrew Bible where the base of שַׁעַּר is a city, Van Wolde shows how the integration of archaeological and co-textual evidence is needed to fully understanding the semantic (conceptual) content of שַׁעַּר in particular instances of use (2009, 72–103). It is, for example, for modern readers impossible to understand וַדָוִד יֹושֵׁב בֵּיֹן־שֶׁנַּיְהַ שָּׁר ‘David was sitting between the two gates’ (2 Sam. 18.24), if they do not know that a complex gate structure includes an outer gate, an inner gate, and a space in-between. In the same vein, modern readers will not fully appreciate Ruth 4, if they lack knowledge of the scenarios (e.g., judicial) typically associated with the space provided by the city gate complex. Most exegetes rightly claim that such use of context to understand language use is common sense. CL is indeed a ‘common sense’ approach that attempts to account for the parameters involved when humans construe the

⁴⁹ Van Wolde (2009, 83) shows that in this domain שַׁעַּר can have as its base, city, tabernacle, or palace. In other words, the ‘gate’ of the city, tabernacle, or palace can be referred to by this lexical item. The conceptual content profiled by שַׁעַּר in each case will depend on the specific base that is involved. A ‘city gate’ implies conceptual content that differs from that of the gate of the tabernacle or a palace, respectively.
meaning of a linguistic construction in a particular context of use. This is also the reason why Cognitive Semantics is associated with the wisdom of traditional historical-philological semantics (Geeraerts 2010, 276).

Since the appearance of her book in 2009, Van Wolde has published further applications of her ‘cognitive relational approach’ on a regular basis. Not all of her interpretations have been accepted uncritically. It is not clear if and how she has incorporated the second (post-2008) phase of Langacker’s views into her model.

Peters (2016) describes Langacker’s model as “at the same time complex, accounting for language as a whole, and deceptively simple, based on only a few key principles.” Peters uses Van Wolde’s abridged version (2009, 205) for his study of the concept of ‘cooking’ in the Hebrew Bible. This study represents an exemplary application of the foundational work done by Van Wolde (2013a; 2013b; 2014; 2015, 2017; 2019).

See, e.g., the critique by Bosman (2011, 115) of Van Wolde (2008). Consider also the debate sparked by her views (2009, 197–200) on the interpretation of אָרַב. See also Van Wolde and Rezetko (2011) and Wardlaw (2014). Some of the linguistic arguments that she uses in a recent contribution to the debate (Van Wolde 2017, 611–47) have convinced me that the debate is by no means over.

Kamp’s (2004) PhD study supervised by Van Wolde calls itself “a cognitive linguistic approach to the book of Jonah.” It can be regarded as an attempt to integrate basic CL insights into cognitive processes (2004, 9–13) with functional models of how information is processed in texts for purposes of analysing the book of Jonah (2004, 4–5). For a relatively similar approach, but focusing only on discourse units, see Robar (2014).
Wolde. He illustrates how encyclopaedic information on cooking practices can be integrated with careful linguistic analyses of the lexical items that are typically used to ground and profile acts of cooking in the Hebrew Bible.

Coleman (2018) addresses the problem of ‘transitivity alternations’, i.e., why, on the one hand, one and the same verbal lexeme may have a different number of complements and, on the other hand, one and the same verbal lexeme may profile different participant roles. In this regard, he draws primarily on Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar and Goldberg’s Construction Grammar (2018, 253) and argues that transitivity is a conceptual phenomenon that is scalar in nature. The transitive construction constitutes a symbolic unit, with a prototypical form-meaning pairing, but it may also have units that differ to various degrees from the prototype. These differences can be explained in terms of extensions and/or different construals of the prototype. For these purposes, Coleman uses insights from linguistic typology and functional grammar to establish the nature (e.g., the range) and functions of transitive constructions across languages. He uses insights from corpus linguists (Hanks 2013) to establish what can be regarded as canonical uses (i.e., the norm) and exploitations (i.e., construals) of the constructions that he distinguishes in BH. A feature of Coleman’s work is that he illustrates how Langacker’s insights can be complemented with studies in linguistic typology, as well as functional and corpus linguistics, to describe a grammatical construction in BH.  

---

53 For a relatively detailed review of Coleman, in particular a critique of his use of the notion ‘focus’, see Van der Merwe (2019a, 121–28).
To better appreciate Coleman (2018), his treatment of verbs of ‘dressing’ and ‘undressing’ illustrates his concept of ‘transitivity alteration’. He investigates the various syntactic constructions in which six verbs of dressing and one of undressing occur in the Hebrew Bible. Among other things, he comes to the conclusion that dressing verbs are typically used in transitive constructions, with a direct object that profiles the role of [Dress]. The [Dressee] as direct object is also relatively frequently attested and its use represents a secondary norm. The alternation is attested crosslinguistically and is called ‘metonymic object change’, because the conceptual contiguity of the [Dress] and [Dressee] allows either of them to be profiled in a particular scene. In such cases, no difference in the semantics of the verb needs be postulated; the difference represents only a difference in subjective construal by the speaker. Although either the [Dress] or the [Dressee] may be the direct object of a construction, the latter is typically the ultimate goal of an action and is marked either by אֵת, a pronominal suffix, or fronting (2018, 119). With dress verbs, an indefinite object may also be omitted, as in לָבֵׁ֖וש ו אֵּיֹן־ל ח ֵ֣ם לִ֑ו litera-

This section is a revision of a section in Van der Merwe (2019a).
Shead’s Radical Frame Semantics (2011) can be linked to Langacker via (1) Fillmore’s Frame Semantics as developed as part of his Construction Grammar and further refined within its application in the FrameNet project, and (2) Croft’s Radical Construction Grammar (see the Gestalt-psychological strand in §2.2.1, above). With this ambitious project, which he acknowledges to be only of exploratory nature (2011, 334–35), Shead illustrates the realities that BH semanticists must face if they want to apply the whole gamut of current CL insights for better understanding the mechanisms of meaning. Croft calls his Construction Grammar ‘radical’ because he argues that linguistic categories at all levels have to be established in a bottom-up fashion, i.e., there are no universal categories that can be used as a point of departure in linguistic analysis. Shead postulates by implication that the same principle applies to semantic categories; hence he calls his model ‘Radical Frame Semantics’. Although he argues that FrameNET represents one of the most sophisticated tools for a more adequate description of BH relational constructions, e.g., verbs (107–42), he cannot escape the need to modify the model for the investigation of a specific non-spoken language (2011, 145–72). What is more, he was forced to develop his own software (HebrewNet) for these purposes, software that he admits has some limitations (2011, 192). He applies his model and software to describe what he labels רשות terms and establishes that they are typically used in explore, search, investigate, and examine frames (2011, 304). I have to concur with Peters (2016, 53) that Shead’s works is extremely thorough, and that he has much to
offer “to the discussion of biblical semantics.” However, one cannot escape the impression that he sometimes tends to provide too much detail.

Looking at the bibliography compiled by De Blois (2000), a PhD which he completed at the Free University in Amsterdam, Langacker’s works do not feature. *The Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* project, with De Blois as editor, was launched in 2003. The initial project was based predominantly on De Blois (2000).

According to De Blois (2002, 280; 2004, 100–1), he is “heavily indebted” to the *Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics* by Ungerer and Schmid (1996). From De Blois (2000, 6–8), it can be inferred that he was influenced by Martin’s (1994) version of frame theory. According De Blois (2002, 8), “the strength of frame theory lies both in its perspective and its systematic approach.” He continues:

As far as its perspective is concerned, the frame theory respects the world view behind a given language.... As far as its systematic approach is concerned, the frame theory enables the lexicographer to describe related concepts in a uniform way, taking into consideration all relevant semantic aspects or attributes of each concept.

From De Blois (2002, 280–81) it is clear that he also embraces CL insights into categorisation and prototype theory, the notion that categories have attributes, as well as the role of metaphorical and metonymic mapping in meaning extensions (De Blois

---

55 Frame theory is typically associated with Fillmore. See, for example, Burton (2017, 13) and Evans (2019, 395–402).
De Blois (2007) interacts critically with Langacker’s (1987) model of semantically based word classes, and comes to the conclusion that they can, with minor modifications and additions, be applied to the categorisation of the lexical stock of BH. De Blois (2009) acknowledges Langacker’s distinction of only two semantically-based word classes, i.e., RELATIONS and THINGS. As far as RELATIONS are concerned, for De Blois the basic domains that “cover the Hebrew semantic field adequately” are POSITION, CONNECTION, PERCEPTION, and DESCRIPTION. In this regard he refers to Langacker’s distinction between a basic and an abstract domain (1987, 147). Unfortunately, the basic domains of De Blois are extremely schematic and he does not indicate if and how his concept of basic domains differs from that of Langacker (1987).

Furthermore, De Blois’s (2004, 100) conviction that CL “requires” a distinction between lexical domains and contextual domains resonates more with Evans’s Access Semantics (Evans 2019, 471–90) than with Langacker’s view in this regard.

3.2. Group 2

Van Hecke (2011) is a revision of the author’s second PhD, completed under the supervision of Ellen van Wolde in 2006. Van

---

56 For these basic domains, subdomains are also distinguished, e.g., DESCRIPTION has the subdomains Attribute, Attitude, and Modification.

57 For a user-friendly description of Langacker’s distinction between basic versus abstract domains, see Evans (2019, 403–17).

58 For other recent publications by the author, see De Blois (2014; 2019).
Hecke (2011, 266–72), like van Wolde (2009), fully embraces Langacker’s views on the role of understanding the meaning of words in terms of a profile and a base in the cognitive domains in which they are used. For understanding the polysemy and semantic structure of words in terms of prototype theory and radial structures, he turns to the seminal work of his colleague at KU Leuven, Dirk Geeraerts.\(^{59}\) He also considers the methodological implications of integrating the insights from the Gestalt-psychological strand (§2.2.1) and the Cognitive Sociolinguistic strand (§2.2.3) mentioned above, and then illustrates how his theoretical framework can be applied to a number of key lexical terms and expressions in Job 12–14. Van Hecke (2011, 291–94) describes in exemplary fashion the innovations of Cognitive Semantics.\(^{60}\) He does this only after pointing out how it builds on historical-philological semantics (286–88). He also acknowledges the instrumental value of structural semantics, e.g., componential analysis (288–91). In his own study of a number of linguistic expressions in his corpus, Van Hecke illustrates in a user-friendly way how the results of empirical research of the distribution of

---

\(^{59}\) See Geeraerts (1997). See also De Prenter (2012), one of Van Hecke’s PhD students. She uses some of Geeraerts’s views for a description of the polysemy of הַרְמָה.

\(^{60}\) Van Hecke (2011, 292) acknowledges insights from the Phenomenological strand (§2.2.2, above), i.e., Lakoff and others. He has himself either supervised (see, e.g., De Joode 2018 and Van Loon 2018) or conducted a number of studies on conceptual metaphor (e.g., 2001b; 2003b), conceptual blending (2005b), and the role of metaphor and metonymy in meaning extension (e.g., 2001; 2007).
linguistic expressions can be integrated with critical use of available encyclopaedic information about these expressions.\textsuperscript{61}

Van der Merwe began to appreciate the potential of CL around 2000. The usage-based thesis of CL aligned with his commitment to describing the ancient language afresh with a bottom-up approach. He was inspired by the perspectives on human categorisation that prototype theory made available, and by the fact that the extensions of linguistic senses could be explained in a principled way and then construed in terms of radially structured maps.\textsuperscript{62} Unlike van Wolde (2009), who made an informed choice to follow Langacker closely, Van der Merwe’s advances into CL were undertaken in a much more eclectic and piecemeal fashion.

\textsuperscript{61} See also Van Hecke (2001; 2003a). See also Leong (2019), a PhD dissertation obtained at KU Leuven with Pierre van Hecke and Dirk Geeraerts as supervisors. The dissertation is a semasiological study to understand the semantic structure of the verbal root שׁלם. Leong (2019, 21) regards frame semantics (as postulated by Fillmore) as his “methodological framework and distributional semantics as the systematic approach” to analyse his data. Somewhat surprising about Leong’s study is that he hypothesises that a cognitive semantic approach will assist him to better understand the meaning a BH verbal root—and also illustrate the new insights gained (2019, 209–10)—but he does not engage at all with other attempts to better understand BH verbal roots from a CL perspective, e.g., Van Wolde (2009); Shead (2011); Bosman (2011); Widder (2014).

\textsuperscript{62} See Van der Merwe (2003; 2006a).
Encouraged by the work of Rechenmacher (2004) and Van Steenbergen (2005), his first empirical study from a CL perspective was an onomasiological study of the concept ‘strength’. Although the study of particles (e.g., conjunctions, focus particles, and discourse markers) has been relatively marginal in CL circles (see the Cognitive Discourse strand in §2.2.4, above), Van der Merwe has conducted a number of cognitively inspired corpus linguistic types of studies in this regard. In most of his studies, an attempt is made (1) to establish prototypical and less-prototypical uses and (2) to provide possible explanations for their polysemous relationships. For establishing the possible senses of function words, he typically draws on the description of equivalents of this closed class of constructions in English, German, and/or Dutch. Whenever possible, frame elements and/or syn-

63 Van der Merwe supervised this PhD project. Van Steenbergen (2005) illustrates the pivotal role of world view in the conceptualisation of negative moral behavior in the book of Isaiah and the implications this has for better understanding the prototypical and less prototypical lexical items referring to negative moral behavior in his corpus. See also Van Steenbergen (2002 and 2003) and Burton’s (2017, 24–25) critical assessment of his work.

64 See Van der Merwe (2006b). Van der Merwe (2018a) provides a semasiological description of the polysemous relationships of the senses of the verbal root חזק.

65 See Van der Merwe (2007; 2009a, 2009b; 2010; 2011; 2014). See also Miller-Naudé and Van der Merwe (2011).
tagmatic patterns that can be associated with particular sense distinctions\textsuperscript{66} are identified.\textsuperscript{67} Van der Merwe has also supervised postgraduate projects that describe the polysemy of other function words, each of which can be associated with the Cognitive Discourse strand (§2.2.4, above), e.g., purpose and result relationships in the case of Yoo (2012), conditionals in the case of Bivin (2017),\textsuperscript{68} and causal relationships in the case of Locatell (2017).\textsuperscript{69} A contribution of each of these studies, which drew as much as possible from cross-linguistic attested patterns of use, is the finding that a pivotal frame element for understanding the coherency relationship between utterances is whether a relationship of content, a relation of speech act, or an epistemic relationship is involved.

\textsuperscript{66} A similar approach has been followed by Bosman (2011) in her exploratory onomasiologically oriented study of lexemes that are typically associated with the concept of affection in BH.

\textsuperscript{67} Most of the findings of these studies are reflected in Van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze (2017).

\textsuperscript{68} Dancygier and Sweetser’s (2005) use of mental space theory to better understand conditionals in English is the theoretical point of departure of this study. See (§2.2.4, above, on the Cognitive Discourse strand.

\textsuperscript{69} Locatell’s study is not limited to the causal functions of כִּי. Like Follingstad (2001), he investigates all uses of the particle in the Hebrew Bible. However, unlike the latter, Locatell is not convinced that כִּי must be understood as having “a single, highly abstract and invariant core and that context provides the variation of nuances” (Locatell 2019, 79). He uses cross-linguistic evidence to postulate a development path for the particle which explains its various senses and the polysemous relationships between them. See also Locatell elsewhere in this volume.
Consider, for example, the different types of coherency relationships in instances where causal relationships are involved.

(1) נַחֲלָה אֶת־בְּכֵלָה האַרְמִיָּה וַיְכֹרָבָּה הָרֵבָּה מְאָדְּוָה
‘There was as no food in all the land, for the famine was very severe.’ (Gen. 47.13)

In (1), a content causal relationship is involved, since the grounds of a state of affairs in nature are due to the objective laws of nature.

(2)וַיְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֲלֵי־לֹא תִירָא אָָּתִיו כִָּ֣י בְּיִדְךָ נַתִּי
‘But the LORD said to Moses, “Do not fear him; for into your hand I have given him.”’ (Num. 21.34)

In (2), the grounds of a speech act, in this case a directive “Do not be afraid,” are not based on any objective law of nature, but are connected to what a speaker says he/she will do. In other words, the causal relationship is subjectively construed by the speaker.

(3)וַיְהִיבוּ אֶל־דָּוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲדֻנִיָּהוּ וַיָּמְלָ֣ךְ אַחֲרֵי וַיִּכְרַ֥א לְכֶל־בָּנָּי
‘And Nathan said, “My lord the king, have you said, ‘Adonijah shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne’? For he has gone down this day, and has sacrificed oxen, fatlings, and sheep in abundance, and has invited all the king’s sons, the commanders of the army, and Abiathar the priest...’’ (1 Kgs 1.24–25)

In (3), again, a subjectively construed causal relationship is involved. In this case, the grounds for making the assertion in 1 Kgs...
1.24 are the evidence that a speaker provides in v. 25; hence the label ‘epistemic relationship’. Causal relationships that are construed by speakers may involve one main clause and one dependent causal clause, e.g., in (2). Often, however, more than one ‘main’ and one dependent clause are involved, see, e.g., (3).

(4) כרייתוּת יהוה נִוהָדִיקָה וְנִוהָדִיקָה רַשִּׁים תַּאֲבָד׃

‘For the LORD takes care of [lit. knows] the way of the righteous, but the way of the wicked will perish.’ (Ps. 1.6).

In (4), the grounds for why the psalmist can utter Ps. 1.1–5 is provided. In this case, the grounds provided confirm what has been said in vv. 1–5, in other words, a substantial chunk of text. Since, it could be argued that the grounds refer to something that both the addresser and the addressee already know, the ‘causal’ particle could also be translated in English as ‘yes’, ‘after all’, or ‘the fact of the matter is’. In BH, the common ground shared or not shared by interlocutors is not lexicalised in the case of causal הב. However, in English (and many other languages) it could be lexicalised. To translate this particle adequately in English, one therefore needs insight into the possible coherency relationships of connectors.70 One type of function word that has received am-

70 The notion of different levels of coherency relationship is not a novel insight of CL; see, for example, Claassen (1983). The insights in this regard should rather be regarded as further evidence that languages typically reflect the subjective construals of their speakers; see also Verhagen (2005). This is why it has been fully embraced by CL scholars, see, e.g., Sanders and Sweetser (2009).
ple attention in CL circles is prepositions, in particular the preposition ‘over’\textsuperscript{71} A number of postgraduate projects supervised by Van der Merwe (Lyle 2012; Mena 2012; Lee 2016; Rodriguez 2017) did not use Lakoff’s ‘full specification account’ model, but rather the ‘principled polysemy account’\textsuperscript{72} proposed by Tyler and Evans (2003).\textsuperscript{73} In these studies the polysemy of BH prepositions is typically explained in terms of crosslinguistically attested patterns of extensions, e.g., from a concrete spatial relationship to more abstract ones and/or paths of grammaticalisation.\textsuperscript{74} The polysemous relationship between the prototypical and less prototypical senses were in most cases construed by means of radially structured maps.

From the conclusion of Widder’s (2014) study, which she labels as an instance of cognitive semantics, it appears that she was influenced by Evans (2009) in the structure of her investigation of a BH lexical set that refers to the concept of ‘teach’ in ancient Israel. She first analysed the syntagmatic frames (e.g., clause types and participant roles) of each of the lexemes (in their

\textsuperscript{71} See Lakoff (1987, 416–61) and Tyler and Evans (2003).

\textsuperscript{72} Evans (2019, 445) concedes that the single functional element posited by this model “is empirically inadequate to account for the range of non-spatial, ‘functional’ sense-units that develop over time, from the prototypical spatial sense”. According to him (2019, 454), his current “theory of Access Semantic” addresses this issue more satisfactorily.

\textsuperscript{73} Lemmer (2014) is not a student of Van der Merwe’s, but also used Tyler and Evans’s (2003) ‘principled polysemy account’ to describe in a Master’s thesis the polysemy of the preposition מִּן in the book of Judges.

\textsuperscript{74} See also Hardy (2014), who focuses on grammaticalisation paths of BH prepositions.
various stem formations) of her set to establish each one’s semantic potential. In the light of the usage patterns, and with reference to relevant contextual considerations, she then established the prototypical sense of a particular lexical unit. After that, she profiled that prototypical sense against a universal concept of teaching that she had formulated. She acknowledges that in the latter approach she deviates from what is typically the case in CL. In short, Widder draws on basic insights from CL that she hypothesises can help her better understand the concept of teaching in BH and then illustrates the value of her approach.\footnote{In this regard, her approach shows some similarities to that of Bosman (2011).}

### 3.3. Group 3

There are two monographs that are revisions of PhD dissertations that are difficult to associate with any of the trends mentioned above.

Burton (2017) displays acute awareness of the challenges inherent in the semantic analysis of an ancient language such as BH. She therefore sets out to develop a cognitive corpus-based approach that “pay[s] close attention to the textual evidence, and all clues available therein” (2017, 31). Unlike some of the onomasiologically oriented attempts referred to above, e.g., Van der Merwe (2006b), Bosman (2011), and Widder (2014), who merely postulate the possible members of the lexical sets of the concepts that they investigate, Burton develops a model to establish in an inter-subjectively verifiable way the lexical units that belong to
the concept that she investigates, viz. ‘glory’. For the frame analysis of the lexical set, Burton’s range of (admittedly subjective) parameters\textsuperscript{76} to consider is in line with what is called a ‘Behaviour Profile Analysis’.\textsuperscript{77} As far as the lexemes of the concept that she has investigated are concerned, Burton illustrates the benefits of her model for better understanding their use, relationships, and the differences between their uses.\textsuperscript{78}

Müller (2018) primarily uses the notion of ‘conceptual metonymy’ to investigate and explain the polysemous senses of the lexeme נפש. She illustrates convincingly that BH is by no means unique in its use (and extensions) of a body part term to profile a human being in terms of the typical experiences that are associated with that body part, in this case ‘throat’.\textsuperscript{79} Like in many other languages, the active zone body part may also be fully grammaticalised to become a pronoun.\textsuperscript{80}

\textbf{4.0. Concluding remarks}

CL is sometimes primarily associated with the study of the conceptualisations and processes behind the metaphors and meto-

\textsuperscript{76} She calls these parameters ‘semantic features’: identity, ascription, giving and taking, verbs, causal relations, reaction, association, metaphor, antonyms, idioms, and distribution.

\textsuperscript{77} See the Cognitive Sociolinguistic strand discussed in §2.3.3, above, and also Thompson and Lyle (2019, 127–48).

\textsuperscript{78} For a critical review of Burton, see Van der Merwe (2018b, 89–93).

\textsuperscript{79} For a critical review of Müller, see Van der Merwe (2019b).

\textsuperscript{80} See also Van der Merwe and Cornelius (2019).
nym that pervade human language. CL has also, however, confirmed and refined a traditional maxim about linguistic meaning, namely, that it is embedded in situated human communication. Furthermore, it has highlighted the fact that language is a dynamic and complex system, and that meaning is both an individually embodied and socially grounded phenomenon that emerges as human subjects use their language. Since the inception of CL in the late 1970s, its shared commitments and theses have laid a firm foundation for research into both the nature of meaning and the meaning-extension of linguistic constructions.

The founding fathers of CL addressed the complexities of language from different angles. Langacker tried to provide an over-arching explanatory framework, first at clause level and more recently at text level. His framework(s) tends to remain relatively stable and leave room for different methodologies, which, of course, may be scrutinised. Lakoff appears to have embraced sometimes promising findings and methodologies that were popular, but have not always stood the test of time, e.g., his conceptual metaphor theory. Nevertheless, the challenges of refining some of his theses prompted more interdisciplinary initiatives, e.g., the use of corpus linguistics methods, sociolinguistic, and diachronic information, as well as linguistic-typological data and patterns of grammaticalisation to better understand (for example) polysemy.

The BH scholars discussed in this paper have responded in different ways to the promises and challenges brought forth by CL. Most of the studies that have been discussed above address

---

81 See, e.g., the critique of Van Wolde referred to above in fn. 51.
specific problems. Van Wolde (2009), and in some sense Van Hecke (2011), given the wider scope of their projects, are the exceptions in this regard. Van Wolde (2009) and Peters (2016) are also unique in opting to use Langacker’s model exclusively. Van Hecke has complemented the insights he gained from Langacker with those of, amongst others, Geeraerts. Van der Merwe and his students have been fairly eclectic in terms of methodological frameworks used in their investigations (of mainly function words). These frameworks have employed the basic theses of CL as points of departure. They also have typically been informed by insights from a linguistic-typological perspective.

A challenge for BH scholars remains that CL provides no ready-made ‘recipe’ for studying an ancient language. The methodological frameworks suggested by Shead (2011) and Burton (2017), as well as the questions noted above about Van Wolde’s interpretations, illustrate the problem. What this broad orientation also hints at is that a way to optimally use distributional data and statistical methods for establishing the different senses of linguistic expressions has yet to be established, both in CL and BH.82
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